

for a one month extension of time in which to respond to the Official Office Action mailed October 3, 2002 and an authorization to charge the appropriate fee to Deposit Account No. 12-1120.

Applicant's Attorney believes that the objections raised under 37 CFR 1.83(a) have been addressed and no longer are viable. Applicant's Attorney further believes that a corrected drawing is not required.

Examiner's objection to claim 1 has been cured by amendment and is no longer appropriate.

Examiner's rejection to claims 2 and 3 under 35 USC 112, ¶ 2 is noted. Claim 2 has been amended to cure that rejection. No basis for the rejection is clearly set forth in so far as claim 3 is concerned.

Claims 1, 2 and 7-9 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Good et al.

Good et al. is cited for a card support 116.

The card support described in the specification of Good et al. at Column 4, lines 34-37. The frame support 116 is not a card support. It does not provide a support to the card, but merely positions the connector member for engagement with the mating connector member on the circuit card.

Good et al. is cited for locating pin 40 engageable with the electronic circuit board.

The pins of Good et al. do not engage the circuit board of Good et al. in any manner.

Good et al. is cited for a movable member 50 carrying a spring 106.

The “movable member carrying at least one biasing spring and at least one engaging member biased by said spring toward said electronic circuit card support and away from said movable member” is not met by the spring of Good et al. inasmuch as it is only useful to put a bias on the latch arm in the opening direction, (Column 6, Lines 1-9) and does not provide a bias as is required by the claims of the application.

With regard to claim 7, Good et al. is cited for a clamp member having a base member 87 and a holding member 96.

However, the claim of this application further states, “... said holding member is restrained relative to said base member by said fasteners.” Applicant’s Attorney can find no fasteners intermediate the base member 87 and the holding member 96 in Good et al. as is required by the application’s claim 7.

With respect to claim 8, Good et al. is cited for an engaging member having a surface (at 94) for engagement with a surface of the card 52 and forcing the card toward support 116.

Claim 8 claims a relation that does not exist in Good et al. In Good et al., the engaging member does not engage any surface or portion of electronic circuit board and does not force the electronic circuit card toward any electronic card support. The engaging member of Good et al. engages a portion of the frame (electronic card support) to latch the lever in its plugged condition. The lever 78 is depressed to the point that the circuit board is fully plugged and then released. On the outward movement effected by the torsion spring, the latch surface contacts the frame 60 and is retained to permit the closure of the cabinet doors.

Claims 1-4 and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang et al.

Wang et al. is cited for a connecting and disconnecting member 10, a card support 100 with locating pins 94, 96, a frame 82, a movable member 16 carrying a spring 56, and an engaging

member 58, said moveable member further comprising a clamp 18 and an actuation assembly 82, 88.

The Wang et al. frame 82 is not fixed. The frame is disposed to be insertable with respect to the electronic card support and is removable from the electronic card support contrary to the structure claimed by claim 1 of the application.

The moveable member of the Wang et al. device does not have a spring which biases the engaging member in any manner as the spring does not engage the engaging member, as stated in claim 1 of the application.

Claims 2, 3, 4 and 7 incorporate by reference the limitations of claim 1 and thus are not met by the citation of Wang, et al.

Wang et al. is cited for the stiffener bar (card support) comprising conductors 114. The conductors 114 of the Wang et al. patent may be found on the opposite side of the circuit board from the stiffener bar 100 and therefor cannot have the conductors 114 therein. Further, the item 114 in Wang et al. is identified in the specification as a flexible circuit member, not conductors.

Wang et al. is cited for clamp member having a base member (head of screw 18 , not shown) and a holding member (screw threads, not shown).

Applicants' Attorney does not understand this application as both members relied upon are not shown. However, the rejection of this claim is inappropriate inasmuch as the claim is allowable due to its dependency upon claim 1 which is clearly allowable over the prior art cited, as has been pointed out and argued above.

Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goode (sic) et al. in view of Kaiser et al.

Good et al. has been addressed above in detail and has been distinguished in all relevant respects. The Kaiser et al. reference is a mystery to Applicants' Attorney as there was no such reference listed on the Form PTO 892; further, there was no copy of the reference supplied to the Applicant. It appears that this rejection should be withdrawn as unsupported.

Applicants note the allowability of claims 5 and 6 if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants wish to defer the presentation of claims 5 and 6 until later as Applicants' Attorney does not feel that it is necessary in light of the allowability of the preceding claims.

Applicants note Examiner's allowance of claims 10-17.

Applicants request reconsideration and re-examination of the claims and a Notice of Allowance. If Examiner should notice any minor matter which can be resolved by a telephone call, she is requested to contact Applicants' Attorney at the telephone number below.

A clean copy of the claims is appended on the following pages.